

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 10-14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kumar et al. (US patent 7,065,597, hereinafter "Kumar"). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kumar as applied to claim 17 and further in views of Scott et al. (U.S patent 5,311,596, hereinafter "Scott"). Claims 1, 10, 16-20, 23 and 30-32 have been amended. New claims 30-32 have been added. No new matter has been added via this amendment.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On September 19, 2007, Examiner Mike Lee and Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Lee agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

Applicant affirms the election without traverse of Species I that includes claims 1-3, 10-14, 16-20 and 23 which are readable thereon. Claims 4-9, 15, 21-22 and 24-29 are withdrawn from consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 17-20 and 13 (Note: applicant believes this should be claim 23 not claim 13) are rejected under U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have now amended to now recite a "computer-readable **storage** medium" which is believed to overcome the noted rejection given that claim 17-20 and 23 as amended claim statutory subject matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 10-14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kumar. Claim 23 was

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kumar as applied to claim 17 and further in views of Scott.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. As now amended, independent claim 1 now recites **"a light-based communication connection between the first component and the second component in order to ensure a defined positional relationship between the first and second components"**, the components are also coupled to each other via a bus. Support for this addition can be found in for example paragraph [0009]. This light-based communication (i.e., infrared connection) connection ensures the positional relationship between the first and second components and prevents a "virtualized" component from accessing the information being transferred via the light-based communication connection which could occur if the information were transferred through the bus. Sensitive information such as encryption keys, etc. can be transferred between the two components using the light-based communication connection without fear that a remote device is monitoring the data that is being transferred as could be the case using a standard open bus, since it is much harder to compromise this secondary communication connection given that the components have to be in a certain positional relationship to each other.

The cited Kumar and Scott references fail to teach or suggest first and second components which are connected via a bus and a secondary light-based communication connection. The primary cited Kumar reference is directed to communicating general purpose events from a downstream controller using a general purpose input (see FIG. 1, 114). Kumar provides no teaching or suggestion of a light-based secondary communication connection which helps ensure a defined positional relationship between first and second components and helps prevent unauthorized access to the communications between the devices. The cited Scott reference teaches a re-authorization procedure between modems that helps protect against active wire taps or spoofing but like Kumar fails to teach or suggest a secondary light-based communication link between devices that are connected via a bus in order to protect sensitive communications as recited.

Given the above, it is believed independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2 and 3 which depend on claim 1 and add further nonobvious limitations are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 10-14, 16-20 and 23 which have

DOCKET NO.: 305777.2 / MSFT-2912
Application No.: 10/759,325
Office Action Dated: June 25, 2007

PATENT

been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. New dependent claims 30-32 find support for example in paragraph [0036] and recite that the light-based communication connection comprises an infrared communication connection. Claims 30-32 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: 305777.2 / MSFT-2912
Application No.: 10/759,325
Office Action Dated: June 25, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 24, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439